

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, last week Congress overwhelmingly passed the balanced budget amendment which began a 7-year journey toward a constitutional requirement of matching receipts with outlays. However, there will be potholes along the way in the form of congressional pork-barrel spending. That is why we need to give the President of the United States the line-item veto authority.

For too long the President has been faced with the Hobson's choice of signing an appropriation act along with all the pork, or shutting down vital Government services. H.R. 2, introduced by Chairman WILLIAM CLINGER and cosponsored by 160 of our colleagues, would make Congress more accountable for its spending by giving the President the ability to delete or reduce specific spending items.

When the President sends a package of rescissions to Congress, the light of public scrutiny will be on the Congress to either accept them or fight them. If Congress chooses to disapprove of the rescissions, it will be in the position of defending indefensible spending, and the voters will be listening. It is about accountability. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2, the Line-Item Veto Act.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT WON'T BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night this House passed a balanced budget amendment, and ever since then we have seen Members getting up here beating their chest and chanting about how wonderful that is. We had one Member on the other side, a colleague of mine, get up last Friday during these same 1-minute speeches and say we fixed the flaw in the Constitution. We took a giant step forward.

Yet the same day, his party in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee marked up a defense supplemental that had \$1.8 billion in new debt that is not offset. So we talk about balancing the budget, we even pass an amendment. It is a magic pill. It is supposed to work. But the next day we add almost \$2 billion new debt, because we cannot really vote for it when it comes to the details.

We have talked for 2 years in here. We have heard the Republican side say cut spending first, cut spending first. Now they have got the chance to do it, and there are all kinds of excuses. They cannot vote to cut specific spending. They are like Wimpy in the Popeye cartoons. They will gladly pay us Tuesday for a hamburger today.

I say we have had enough borrow and spend, borrow and spend, borrow and spend, and the vote last Thursday night did not balance the budget.

#### ON THE MEXICAN LOAN GUARANTEES

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, last week I came here to the House floor to give a 1-minute on the concerns of my constituents regarding the proposed Mexican loan guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, only minutes later, a fax from a concerned citizen who saw me on the floor was waiting on my desk. This person does not live in my district. He is from all of the way across the Nation in Henderson, NV. But his words rang familiar to those of people in my district.

Mr. Speaker, the message was, "America is not made up of, nor successful as a nation because of elitists or CEOs. America is successful because of those willing to put their heart and soul as well as their backs into the very creation of America."

Mr. Speaker, he continued to admonish that, "Passing bills, arguing opinion, stating your support and even wishing does not get the wall painted, one must pick up a brush and take the risk of getting paint on their hands to get the job done."

Mr. Speaker, this message is not unlike what your constituents are telling you. Let us rise above the morass of petty partisanship that cripples this body and threatens to cripple this Nation, and move forward with positive legislation that impacts the lives of our people.

#### PERMITTING COMMITTEE CHAIR- MEN TO SCHEDULE HEARINGS

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 43 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 43

*Resolved*, That, in rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, clause 2(g)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The chairman of each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the chairman of the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subparagraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems."

□ 1140

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], for

the purposes of debate only. All time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 43 amends clause 2(g)(3) of House rule 11 to restore by rule what has been the standard operating procedure around here ever since I can remember, and that is to permit committee chairmen to schedule hearings.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a question arose as to the literal meaning of the rule which states that a committee, I repeat, a committee shall call hearings at least a week in advance unless the committee for good cause determines that such should be called sooner.

The Parliamentarian's office confirmed that the term "committee" means just that. The committee acting collectively.

As a result of the point of order raised against a particular hearing that was overruled by a committee chairman in the committee, the Committee on Rules had to recommend to the House a waiver of the rule in order to bring a measure to the floor of the House last week.

Had we not done so, a legitimate point of order could have been raised in the House against the consideration of that measure.

Mr. Speaker, because of this interpretation every committee of this House was naturally thrown into a state of uncertainty as to the fate of its hearing and its bills. Consequently, the Committee on Rules was asked to look into the matter and resolve it as soon as possible.

Last Monday I introduced House Resolution 43 to substitute the word "chairman" for the word "committee" in that rule, as the party responsible for calling hearings.

The Committee on Rules met and reported the resolution on Thursday by voice vote with no amendments offered.

At that time, I was led to believe that was not a controversial issue and that everyone agreed there was a need to legally restore what has been the standard operating procedure in this House for many, many years.

However, since not all the bases have been touched by the minority in order to be safe we reported an open rule, should any subsequent concerns or amendments surface.

Mr. Speaker, in my experience such a special rule has never been reported before on a simple rule change such as this which is already privileged for House floor consideration without requiring a special rule. It was not until after we reported that we received letters from some very respected ranking minority Members expressing concern